

Date: Sat, 31 Jul 93 04:30:11 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #273
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 31 Jul 93 Volume 93 : Issue 273

Today's Topics:

 ARRL and *its* members
 CW Privileges (Was: Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk) (3 msgs)
 Written CW (Was: Re: Real CBers)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 30 Jul 93 13:44:02 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!
IASTATE.EDU!wjturner@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ARRL and *its* members
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <239cn9INNuf7@emx.cc.utexas.edu>, oo7@emx.cc.utexas.edu (Derek Wills)
writes:

>

> I am really amazed at the amount of bitching about ARRL on this group.

I wouldn't say I don't believe it, but other than that I agree with Derek. The
ARRL does *a lot* for hams in the United States (not just ARRL members) for the
dues that members pay. If they wanted to, they could refuse to do anything for
non-members. However, I think that if they did this, many hams would suddenly
complain that these services were crucial to their good hamming, and these hams
would still refuse to become members.

I agree that non-members should be able to voice their opinions to the ARRL,
since the ARRL does many things for them, but they also don't really have room

to complain when the ARRL doesn't do *exactly* what they want. After all, the ARRL is a private organization and doesn't have to listen to them at all.

> Of course, everyone at ARRL should be sitting at their terminals, ready
> to reply to any criticism instantaneously. At the same time they should
> not be wasting their time sitting at their terminals. They ought to be
> doing much, much more and charging much, much less for it. Get real, folks!

Exactly!!

Just my \$0.02.

```
Will Turner, N0RDV      -----  
wjturner@iastate.edu    | "Are you going to have any professionalism, |  
twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu | or am I going to have to beat it into you?" |  
TURNERW@vaxld.ameslab.gov -----
```

Date: 30 Jul 93 18:05:10 GMT
From: idacrd.ccr-p.ida.org!idacrd!n4hy@uunet.uu.net
Subject: CW Privileges (Was: Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

The only time I have heard CW on any of these bands outside of contest time was EME.

Bob

--

Robert W. McGwier | n4hy@ccr-p.ida.org
Center for Communications Research | Interests: amateur radio, astronomy, golf
Princeton, N.J. 08520 | Asst Scoutmaster Troop 5700, Hightstown

Date: 30 Jul 93 14:25:14 GMT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: CW Privileges (Was: Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, stocker@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov
(ERICH FRANZ STOCKER) writes:

>The issue of code doesn't, in my opinion, have anything to do with Tech on
>HF (I don't think we need it unless we meet the code requirement which
>currently is an international requirement) but rather whether the code is

>the only differentiator that should be used to separate license classes.
>I would prefer a more comprehensive theory portion, then an optional 25
>question test on specific communications mode and operating procedures. I
>would opt to have 5 wpm for general and 13wpm for advanced and extra. I
>don't really see why the 20 wpm for extra is a good determiner of extra
>knowledge. Look at the theory for Advanced vs Extra. I think that the
>theory for extra should be at a very high level. My personal view is that
>should be the determiner.

Well, I do know a few Extras that ask *me* to solder their PL-259s, so
go figure. I also know a few no-code extras, who have forgotten the 75%
they once knew to pass the code test at 20 wpm.

All in all, I don't think the existing tests are too far off the mark.
The only thing that annoys me is that one must pass the 20 wpm to gain
the extra phone portion of the bands. Just doesn't make sense. IMHO,
entirely personal, mind you, I think the Advanced class license should
include all phone frequencies, with the 20 wpm test reserved for the
extra CW priveleges.

(Rustle, rustle ... the sound of a flame suit being put on.)

73 from ARRL HQ, Ed

yN

Ed Hare, KA1CV
American Radio Relay League
225 Main St.
Newington, CT 06111
(203) 666-1541 - voice
ARRL Laboratory Supervisor
RFI, xmtr and rcvr testing

ehare@arrl.org

"You will never put the puzzle together
if you keep putting all of the pieces
back in the box." Colleen

Date: 29 Jul 1993 18:06:41 GMT

From: swrinde!sdd.hp.com!spool.mu.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!
transfer.stratus.com!sw.stratus.com!fms@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: CW Privileges (Was: Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk)

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1890@arrl.org>, jkearman@arrl.org (Jim Kearman) writes:

> In rec.radio.amateur.policy, gregl@news.delphi.com (Greg Law) writes:

> <...>

> >

> >Morse code is less important that it was several years ago, but it is still

> >an important mode of communication for amateur radio. I would personally like

> >to see Technician-class licensees have access to a small segment of a CW
> >band for code practice, but unfortunately it was declined.
> <...>
> > -- Greg KE4DPX
> >
> This is an interesting idea. Speaking only for myself, why not
> give some CW privileges to Techs who haven't passed Element 1A?
> If you don't work CW, you won't use it, if you're interested,
> you will? Worth thinking about.
>
> KR1S
>
> >

Well, let's see. There's the weak-signal section of 6 meters, the weak signal section of 2 meters, what may become the weak-signal section of 222, the weak signal section of 440... There are LOTS of places for Techs to do CW! In fact, a couple of our local techs rigged up keyers that would key their HTs and did CW over FM, which is also perfectly legal. One of these guys just passed his Extra, one is most of the way to General (the third hasn't had time to get on the air since they rigged up the keyers, unfortunately). Plus lots of the microwave activity around here is done via CW.

Why is it that everyone seems to think that the only CW that happens on the bands happens below 28.3 MHz? Are these the same people that believe that the only things you'll find in VHF/UHF are FM phone and packet? There's a whole WORLD of things above 30 MHz, and CW's one of 'em!

73 de Faith N1JIT (former Technician, still fairly codeless :-)

--

Faith M. Senie	InterNet: fms@vos.stratus.com
Stratus Computer, Inc.	InterNet: fms@hoop.sw.stratus.com
55 Fairbanks Blvd.	Pkt Radio: n1jit@wa1phy.ma.usa.na
Marlboro, MA 01752	Phone: (508)460-2632

"I'm afraid I don't know very much about Romulan Disruptor settings" --Spock

Date: Fri, 30 Jul 93 21:15:51 GMT
From: btree!bly@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Written CW (Was: Re: Real CBers)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jul27.172718.23080@newsgate.sps.mot.com> rapw20@email.sps.mot.com writes:

>In article <gBgc8B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert)
>writes:
>> (. and - CW deleted)
>> Hummmmm....I always thought Morse was a aural language.
>> ...
>
>Does anyone else have problems decoding the . and - CW that people
>have been posting in this thread? I mean, I can copy 20 or so wpm by
>ear but have a difficult time with the 'written' CW. I have to hum
>it to myself before I can 'copy' it. I guess once you learn it in one
>sensory medium it's difficult to transfer it to another.

What? Your news reader doesn't have a "DECODE MORRIS" option. Better
get the new rev. Will decode morris to ascii text or sound.
-Roger

Date: 29 Jul 1993 08:40:07 -0700
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!
uwm.edu!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!chnews!ornews.intel.com!ornews.intel.com!not-for-
mail@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <22hbg9INN6ju@bashful.isi.com>, <22tqtk\$50e@news.delphi.com>,
<1993Jul29.144058.479@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>du
Subject : Re: Technicians can use CW, was Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

In article <1993Jul29.144058.479@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>
whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) writes:
>
>A simple way to get a code practice group on the air for VHF would
>be to use your 2 meter (or 440) HT and a separate code practise oscillator.
>When it is your turn in the QSO, just hold the mic in front of the code
>practice oscillator's speaker and send.

A2 emissions. I've heard it several times on the Citizens Band but never
on any ham bands. In this neck of the woods the CW portions as well as
the SSB areas of all VHF & UHF ham bands is very scarcely populated.
I can't see anything wrong with giving 10 meter CW privileges to those
who haven't demonstrated their skill yet. It might add some more ham
traffic to an area of 10 meters that is much more used by non-hams
currently (IMHO).

--

WA7LDV zardoz@ornews.intel.com

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1993 15:34:14 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!IASTATE.EDU!
wjturner@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CAso2z.F7H@egr.uri.edu>,
<930728.114323.7q4.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>, <238345\$cp4@senator-
bedfellow.MIT.EDU>te.edu
Reply-To : wjturner@IASTATE.EDU (William J Turner)
Subject : Re: Real CBers

In article <238345\$cp4@senator-bedfellow.MIT.EDU>, cthomas@athena.mit.edu
(Michael T Ford) writes:

> .--- ..- ... - -... . -.-. .- ..- - -.-
>
> -.. --- -. - -.- -. --- .-- -. -.- --- .. . -.. ---
>
> -. --- - - . .- -. - -.- -.. --- -. --- .
>
> .- -. .-... ..- . .-.-. -.-
>
>
> --... --- -.. . .- -.. -.-. -.-.

.. .- -. .-... .-.-. --- -.-. .-... .- .-... -.-. -.-.-

Besides, just because someone has not passed a code test does not mean they
don't know code (at some speed, however slow or fast), or that they can't get a
book or something and look up what you are saying.

--
Will Turner, NORDV -----
wjturner@iastate.edu | "Are you going to have any professionalism, |
twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu | or am I going to have to beat it into you?" |
TURNERW@vaxld.ameslab.gov -----

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 93 14:40:58 GMT
From: walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <16JUL199308294872@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>,
<22hbg9INN6ju@bashful.isi.com>, <22tqtk\$50e@news.delphi.com>~
Subject : Technicians can use CW, was Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

In article <22tqtk\$50e@news.delphi.com> gregl@news.delphi.com (Greg Law) writes:
>Morse code is less important than it was several years ago, but it is still
>an important mode of communication for amateur radio. I would personally like
>to see Technician-class licensees have access to a small segment of a CW
>band for code practice, but unfortunately it was declined.
> -- Greg KE4DPX

No-code technicians do have access to the CW only segment of the 6 meter band (50.0 to 50.1). Additionally, there is nothing that prevents a group of No-code techs (or anyone else) from operating CW in other segments of the various VHF and UHF bands (acknowledging observation of the accepted band plans). Folks here in the northeast can even listen to ARRL code practice transmissions in the 2 meter band (check the latest QST for exact frequency).

A simple way to get a code practice group on the air for VHF would be to use your 2 meter (or 440) HT and a separate code practice oscillator. When it is your turn in the QSO, just hold the mic in front of the code practice oscillator's speaker and send. While that isn't pure CW in a technical sense, you are able to then send and receive CW like transmissions, it's just that you are sending the audio CW as an modulated FM signal. Also, there's no reason this couldn't be done over a wider area using a repeater. Taint sophisticated, but it works.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1993 15:39:32 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!IASTATE.EDU!
wjturner@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <16JUL199308294872@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>,
<22hbg9INN6ju@bashful.isi.com>, <22tqtk\$50e@news.delphi.com>
Reply-To : wjturner@IASTATE.EDU (William J Turner)
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

In article <22tqtk\$50e@news.delphi.com>, gregl@news.delphi.com (Greg Law) writes:

> Morse code is less important than it was several years ago, but it is still
> an important mode of communication for amateur radio. I would personally like
> to see Technician-class licensees have access to a small segment of a CW
> band for code practice, but unfortunately it was declined.

Just for reference, in case someone has forgotten :-), the Technician-class
licensees do have access to CW bands. Namely, every amateur band above 50 MHz.
(I'm sure you meant "HF CW bands", but that isn't what you said, and it's hard
to read people's minds sometimes. :-) Some portions--like the 144.00 to 144.01
or .1 (can't remember which :() is CW *only*.

--

Will Turner, NØRDV	-----
wjturner@iastate.edu	"Are you going to have any professionalism,
twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu	or am I going to have to beat it into you?"
TURNERW@vaxld.ameslab.gov	-----

Date: 30 Jul 93 20:22:56 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!
news.nd.edu!mac22@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul22.020659.17371@anomaly.sbs.com>,
<CAtu1A.Mrz@hpbbird.bbn.hp.com>, <1993Jul29.133503.1144@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>
Subject : Re: Profanity was(Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk)

In article <1993Jul29.133503.1144@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>, bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov
(Tom Bodoh) wrote:

> I'm not sure whether this is progress or whether we are losing valuable
> skills.

"Losing" valuable skills? "Losing" valuable skills? I notice you seem to
have overlooked a valuable skill . . . It's called "English"--look into it.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #273
